

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 17 through 31 remain in this application. Claims 17 and 22 have been amended.

Claims 17 through 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,203 B1 to Feiertag, et al. (hereinafter Feiertag).

Independent claim 27 as originally filed provides, *inter alia*, a wireless communication device that receives a media content item and a first time-to-live (TTL) associated with the media content item from a remote device, receives a second TTL associated with the media content item from the remote device, and replaces the first TTL with the second TTL. Thus, original and replacement TTL's are received from a remote device.

In contrast, Feiertag describes a method of a data server for updating, internally at the data server, a time-to-live period for a data object stored in cache. As illustrated in FIG. 2B and explained at col. 6, lines 4 and 5, and col. 9, lines 1 through 4, the TTL determination/calculation logic 242 calculates the time-to-live for the data object in the cache 206 and, thereafter, updates the time-to-live period of the data object in the cache. The data server does not receive the TTL from any type of remote device, as required by claim 27. As illustrated in FIG. 3, the data server does receive a request 302, but this request does not include any type of TTL. For Feiertag, the new time-to-live for the data object is generated within the data server in response to receiving a request for unexpired data or for expired data that matches data retrieved from a server. In any case, the TTL is generated internal to the data server and it not received from a remote device, as required by claim 27. Therefore, claim 27 distinguishes from Feiertag.

Similar to claim 27, independent claims 17 and 22 as amended provide, *inter alia*, providing a second TTL to a remote device to replace a first TTL. Feiertag does not describe or suggest providing a second TTL to a remote device to replace a first TTL, as required by claims 17 and 22. Therefore, similar to claim 27, claims 17 and 22 distinguish from Feiertag.

Claim 18 through 21, 23 through 26, and 28 through 31 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 17, 22 and 27. Therefore, claims 18 through 21, 23 through

26, and 28 through 31 distinguish from Feiertag for the reasons stated above for claims 17, 22 and 27.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 17 through 31 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| <u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u> | <u>04/06/2009</u> |
| Hisashi D. Watanabe | Date |
| Attorney for Applicant(s) | |
| Registration No. 37,465 | |
| Telephone: (847) 523-2322 | |
| Facsimile: (847) 523-2350 | |